

REMARKS

Applicants amend claims 1 and 19. Claim 27 is canceled without prejudice. As discussed in more detail below, support for the amendments can be found in the specification, e.g., page 36. Thus, no new matter is added. The various grounds of rejection are discussed below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 14-18, 19-21, 23, and 25-28 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,748,896 of Daly.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of managing a telecommunications network comprising generating a plurality of user profiles, each of which provides a network management access to a user. Each profile defines network management capabilities assigned to a respective user for configuring one or more network devices that are suitable for routing packetized data. The method further comprises listing the network devices capable of being managed through the user profiles, and utilizing at least one of the user profiles to *physically and logically* configure one or more of the network devices within a scope of that profile.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, on page 36, and throughout the remainder of the specification. Thus, no new matter is added.

Daly is generally directed to managing instantiations of services, such as print or email, on network servers (See, e.g., col. 7, lines 3-5). A plurality of service objects gather information from the network servers for creating a list of available services, and a service manager window allows a user to view and/or manage the instantiation of these services (See, e.g., col. 6, lines 57-66, and FIG. 5A).

Daly, however, does not teach or suggest user profiles for configuring network devices that are suitable for routing *packetized data*. Rather, Daly teaches user profiles for managing *instantiations of network services* on network servers. These network services, however, do not provide routing of packetized data. Rather, they relate to services such as print and email.

Additionally, Daly does not teach utilizing its user profiles to both *physically and logically* configure network devices. For example, a user in Daly having administrative privileges can administer an instantiation of a service by, e.g., modifying its status and/or attributes. Such a user, however, cannot modify the physical configuration of that service, e.g., disabling a port through which a print service communicates with a printer.

In contrast, the claimed method allows a user to not only logically but also physically configure a network device within a scope of its profile. For example, the user can enable or disable a port of the device – a modification of the device's physical configuration. In addition, the user can logically configure the that port by, e.g., provisioning SONET paths on that port (See, e.g., specification, page 36, lines 11-27).

Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-7, 14-18, and 27-28 which depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1, distinguish patentably over Daly.

Claim 19, as amended, recites a method of managing a telecommunications network that comprises adding a user profile to a network management system that is suitable for managing network devices capable of routing packetized data. The method further comprises editing parameters within the user profile to establish management capabilities assigned to one or more users associated with the profile for physically and logically configuring one or more of the network devices, and listing the network devices that are capable of being managed through the user profile.

The above arguments apply with equal force to establish that claim 19, and claims 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 that depend on claim 19, are also patentable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 8-13, 22, and 24 as being obvious over Daly.

Claim 8-13 depend on claim 1, and claims 22 and 24 depend on claim 19, and hence incorporate the features of claim 1 and 19, respectively. As discussed above, Daly fails to teach salient features of claims 1 and 19 and, consequently, those of claims 8-13, 22, and 24.

Accordingly, the above reasoning applies to establish that claims 8-13, 22, and 24 are patentable over Daly.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the application. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (617) 439-2514 if there are any remaining issues.

Dated: June 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Reza Mollaaghababa

Registration No.: 43,810

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP

World Trade Center West

155 Seaport Boulevard

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604

(617) 439-2000

(617) 310-9000 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant